

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 1948/US/2
USPTO Facsimile No. (703) 872-9306

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, Applicant submits the following summary of the Interview conducted with Examiner Edward R. Cosimano on 18 May 2005. During the Interview, Applicant presented an amendment to the claims which distinguished the claimed subject matter over the cited prior art of record as reflected above the above listed claim amendments. Amendments consistent with the foregoing were suggested and agreed upon by the Examiner for each of the pending claims. Specifically, the agreed upon amendments to the claims are as listed above.

Further, as discussed during the interview and as reflected above in the present amendments to the specification, the objections set forth in the Office action of 12/7/04 have been addressed.

During the interview the Examiner indicated that in view of the above amendments to the claims, the rejections of the above pending claims under 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 103 and 112, paragraph 2 would be withdrawn.

Further, the characterizations of the invention by the Examiner were to be rescinded and corrected to more accurately reflect each of the pending claims. Applicant, however, considers the scope of each claim is properly interpreted based upon the claim language itself and not upon the Examiner's attempt to characterize the same.

Further, the Examiner stated during the Interview that the rejection to claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C 103 in view of Kuzma (5,771,289), Naudus (6,412,006) and/or Grande (2002/0198850) would be withdrawn because the cited references alone or together do not teach a "franking criteria" which is "indicative of the relative importance as set by the user."

Further, it was agreed that the rejection to claims 13-20 under 35 USC 103 in view of Voticky (6,351,764), Grande (2002/0198850) or Naudus (6,412,006) would be withdrawn because the cited references alone or together do not teach a "franking criteria" which is "set by the sender."

Last, the Examiner acknowledged that the article mentioned in section 13 of the Office Action has been located and that this requirement will be withdrawn.

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 1948/US/2
USPTO Facsimile No. (703) 872-9308

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is being submitted in response to the Office Action of 7 December 2004. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview of 18 May 2005 and the diligent review of the prior art of record and the claims and subject matter of the present application.


This Amendment is submitted contemporaneously with a petition for a three-month extension of time in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.136(a). Accordingly, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 in the amount of \$1,020, for three-month extension of time fee. The Applicant believes no further fees or petitions are required. However, if any such petitions or fees are necessary, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 accordingly.

In view of the Amendments to the Specification and Claims, as set forth above, and in light of the Interview Summary, Applicant contends each of the presently pending claims, as amended herein, are patentable over the prior art of record. As such Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance as soon as possible.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned at (303) 260-6362.

Dated: 6 June 2005

Respectfully submitted,


John T. Kennedy, Registration No. 42,717
Attorney for Applicant
USPTO Customer No. 20686

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
370 Seventeenth Street, Suite 4700
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647
Tel: 303-629-3400
Fax: 303-629-3450